UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/782,554	02/19/2004	Brooke L. Small	210507US (4081-03900)	5152	
	7590 10/23/200 ILLIPS CHEMICAL (	EXAMINER			
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750			NGUYEN, TAM M		
PLANO, TX 75024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
				PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/782,554	SMALL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	17 divi ivi. 1400 l'El4	1707	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
periods:			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		in the final rejection which	hoveria later. In
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The approprianally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered bed	cause
(a)⊠ They raise new issues that would require further co	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	,		e issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a			
NOTE: New added claims 77 and 78 raise new is:		<u>sideration and/or searc</u>	<u>:h. Therefore,</u>
the amendment will not be entered. (See 37 CFR 1	* **	mnliant Amandmant (F	)TOL 224)
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		inpliant Amendinent (F	10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmen	t canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	iowabie ii submitted iii a separate, i	unicity filed afficianten	t carreening the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	🛛 will not be entered, or b) 🗌 wil	l be entered and an ex	planation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	vided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12,20-29,31-38,46-54 and 56-67</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	( days NOT also at 10 and 10 a	and the second	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu</li> <li>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		i condition for allowand	e because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.  Other:			
	/Tam M. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1797	
	i iiiiary Examiner, Art O	THE 1131	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument that DeBoer does not teach a diluent comprising 1-butene, 1-dodecene, 1-tetradecene, 1-hexadecene, 1-octadecene or combination thereof is not persuasive. DeBoer teaches that the product stream from the oligomerization reactor comprises 1-dodecene as claimed. The limitation "diluent" is encompassed by DeBoer. It is reminded that appliant just names 1-dodecene as a diluent.

The argument that a significant distinction between the present invention and the the process of DeBoer is that the presently claims recite reactive diluents in contrast to inert solvents used by DeBoer is not persuasive. As discussed above, DeBoer teaches that the product stream from the oligomerization reactor comprises 1-dodecene as claimed. Since 1-dodecene is the same as the claimed diluent, it would be expected that 1-dodecene would has a function as discussed. There is no distintion between the claimed 1-dodecene diluent and 1-dodecene of DeBore. The claimed process does not exclude a use of an inert sovent and also does not recite that the diluent is a reactive diluent

The argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate the different between a 1-dodecene diluent as recited in the pending claims and DeBoer's 1-dodecene reaction product is not persuasive. The pending claims recite that the effluent from the reaction zone comprising a diluent such as 1-dodecene. DeBore teaches that the effluent from the reaction zone comprising 1-dodecene as claimed. There is no distintion between the claimed 1-dodecene diluent and 1-dodecene of DeBore.